

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/643,094	08/18/2003	Robert A. Hickey	EMP-129US	EMP-129US 3336	
24314	7590 11/17/2004		EXAMINER		
JANSSON, SHUPE & MUNGER, LTD 245 MAIN STREET			BENNETT, GEORGE B		
RACINE, WI 53403			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2859		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/643,094	HICKEY, ROBERT A.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	G. Bradley Bennett	2859			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
 1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2003. 2a) ⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) 8-14 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers		,			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 18 August 2003 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		,			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)		•			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date S. Palent and Trademark Office.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				

Art Unit: 2859

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szumer (US Pat. No. 6,418,634).
- 3. Szumer discloses the invention substantially as claimed where: 10 illustrates a box level with vial openings 20, 22 including vials secured within; 26 are handholds and hang openings are included within endpieces 16. The handholds have liners of a rubber material that form rims and an application plane as claimed (see FIG 2). However, Szumer does not disclose the hang liners as claimed. This is merely duplicating the known liners of Szumer for a multiplied effect and does not render the claimed device patentable [see St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc., 193 USPQ 8, 11 (7th Cir. 1977)]. Using additional liners in conjunction with the openings of Szumer will provide additional contact points to the application plane. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to use the liners as taught by Szumer through any additional orifice (such as the hang members at 16) for the purpose of providing additional, raised surface areas on the application plane.

Application/Control Number: 10/643,094 Page 3

Art Unit: 2859

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 8-14 are allowed. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the detailed flange structure as claimed.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's arguments filed 6 OCT 2004 regarding claims 1-8 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper speculation, unfounded assumptions or hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the instant application, it was within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to use further raised rubber inserts to increase the contact surface area of the high-friction, non-slip interface taught by Szumer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to G. Bradley Bennett whose telephone number is 571.272.2237. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F.F. Gutierrez can be reached on 571.272.2245. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/643,094

Art Unit: 2859

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G. Bradley Bennett Primary Examiner

Page 4

Art Unit 2859

gbb 21 JUN 2004